UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/538,811	03/09/2006 Aaron Weinberg		200512.00033	5822	
	7590 06/27/200 R & PARKS, LLP	EXAMINER			
One GOJO Plaz		TONGUE, LAKIA J			
Suite 300 AKRON, OH 4	4311-1076		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1645		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/27/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@hahnlaw.com akron-docket@hotmail.com

Office Action Summary		Applic	Application No. App		applicant(s)				
		10/53	8,811	WEIN	WEINBERG, AARON				
		Exam	iner	Art U	Art Unit				
			J. TONGUE	1645					
The MAILIN Period for Reply	G DATE of this communi	cation appears or	the cover sheet	with the corresp	ondence ad	ldress			
WHICHEVER IS L - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS - If NO period for reply is - Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the	TATUTORY PERIOD FOONGER, FROM THE Management of the provisions from the mailing date of this common specified above, the maximum state as to rextended period for replying the Office later than three months and astment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In r unication. tutory period will apply a will, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUN o event, however, may nd will expire SIX (6) M exapplication to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailin ABANDONED (35 U.	ng date of this co S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)⊠ Responsive	to communication(s) file	d on <i>13 June 200</i>	15						
· <u> </u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 June 2005</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.								
' =		<i>′</i> —		atters prosecuti	on as to the	e merits is			
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims	·	•	. ,	,					
<u> </u>		nnligation							
·	Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
·	is/are objected to.	n and/or alastian	roquiromont						
6)[2] Claiii(s) <u>1-3</u>	<u>7</u> are subject to restriction	ni and/or election	requirement.						
Application Papers									
9)☐ The specifica	tion is objected to by the	e Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted o	r b)∏ objected t	to by the Examir	ner.				
Applicant may	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
	n's Patent Drawing Review (P e Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	TO-948)	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-4 lo(s)/Mail Date. of Informal Patent Ap	<u>_</u> .				

Application/Control Number: 10/538,811 Page 2

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-13, drawn to a defensin-stimulating composition, comprising a Fusobacterium associated defensin inducer polypeptide and an excipient.

Group II, claim(s) 14-26, drawn to a method for treating a beta-defensin associated disorder comprising administering to a subject in need thereof a defensin-stimulating composition, comprising a Fusobacterium associated defensin inducer polypeptide and an excipient.

Group III, claim(s) 27-32, drawn to a method for stimulating production of beta-defensin-2, beta-defensin-3, or both comprising contacting a cell with a defensin-stimulating composition, comprising a Fusobacterium associated defensin inducer polypeptide and an excipient.

Group IV, claim(s) 33 and 34, drawn to a method for identifying a composition that stimulates BD-2 or BD-3 expression in an epithelial cell of a vertebrate, the method comprising: a) contacting the epithelial cell with a composition comprising an extracellular component of a BD-2 or BD-3 resistant bacterium; b) measuring BD-2 or BD-3 expression in the epithelial cell.

Group V, claim(s) 35-37, drawn to a method of screening for agents that induce an innate immune response in a human comprising providing a cellular extract of a commensal microorganism and determining a change in the innate immune response.

Additional Election Requirement Applicable to Groups I-III

In addition, Groups I-III detailed above reads on patentably distinct agents and patentably distinct sequences. Each agent is patentably distinct because they are distinct and have differing chemical and immunological properties. Each sequence is

patentably distinct because they are sequences with differing biochemical and immunological properties and a further restriction is applied to each Group. Should Applicant elect Group I, Applicant must further elect a specific sequence. Should Applicant elect Group II, Applicant must further elect a specific disease as well as its etiological agent.

Should Applicant elect Group III, Applicant must further elect a specific defensin or combination thereof.

Applicant is advised that examination will be restricted to only the elected antigen or combination of antigens and this should not be construed as a species election.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking Groups I-V appears to be a defensin. However, Krisanaprakornkit et al. (Infection and Immunity, 2000; 68(5): 2907-2915) disclose inducible expression of β-Defensin 2 by *Fusobacterium nucleatum* (see abstract and title).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse.

To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Application/Control Number: 10/538,811 Page 5

Art Unit: 1645

sommensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C.' 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lakia J. Tongue whose telephone number is 571-272-2921. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shanon Foley can be reached on 571-272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/538,811 Page 6

Art Unit: 1645

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJT 6/19/08

/Robert A. Zeman/ for Lakia J. Tongue, Examiner of Art Unit 1645